

Regarding the first element indicated above, the rejection relies on the Sezan et al. representative frames of different programs (see left-hand column of Fig. 9) to teach multiple items of audio/video contents as recited in the claims.

Regarding the second element indicated above, the rejection relies on the Sezan et al. key frame views (see the bottom of Fig. 9) to teach the slide components of an audio/video slide.

As also indicated above, another element of the claims is “providing a description of the slide components.” Because the rejection relies on the Sezan et al. key frame views to teach slide components, Sezan et al. would need to teach providing a description of those key frame views to anticipate the claims. However, the display in Fig. 9 provides no description at all of the key frame views.

The Office Action notes that that the key frame views (“slide components”) in Fig. 9 are displayed one after another, and it is concluded that the sequential display of key frame views is a sequential display of a description of slide components.

However, such interpretation of the claims and prior art disregards the recitation “description of” in the claims. Assuming *arguendo* that it is proper to interpret the sequential display of key frame views as a sequential display of slide components as recited in the claims, the PTO has the additional requirement of identifying the provision of a “description of” the sequential display of slide components. This “description”, explicitly recited in the claims, is not addressed in the Office Action. Accordingly, the rejection is unjustified for at least this reason.

Fig. 9 displays the key frame views without *any* description. Because the rejection relies on these key frame views to teach slide components, it is not proper to rely on the same teaching to teach a *description* of those components, also. Thus, the rejection of claims 10, 11, and 14-18 is improper.

Applicants add that the “description” in the context of the present invention describes the contents as text and the like on a physical file. The Key Frame View shown in Fig. 9 of Sezan et al. is by no means such a description.

Regardless of any link between a slide component and original content in Sezan et al. (the <KeyFrame View> specifies the start/end ID of the key frame), such link would merely indicate a relationship between the start/endpoint ID of the segment related to the key frame and the ID of the frame displayed as the key frame, that is, a relationship between the segment and point. In applicants’ invention, the slide component itself is also a segment, and a relationship between the segment of the slide component and segment related to the slide component, that is, a relationship between segments, cannot anticipate the “description” recited in the claims.

Even if the Office Action indicates that the slide components corresponding to a plurality of contents have a direct link with the original contents, the description in Sezan et al. is closed within a specific program and has no means for referring to other programs. Accordingly, in Sezan et al., a link with the slide components and a plurality of contents related thereto cannot be described by a single description. However, such is feasible with the present invention.

Although the identifiers indicated by a link between the slide components and original contents are frame start/end IDs at most, identifiers of external files can be included using the present invention. Namely, a plurality of slide components may belong to different contents, respectively.

Claim 11 is rejected based on the description related to the Shot View in Fig. 8. However, as mentioned above, only a plurality of segments of a selected specific program are indicated in this case as well, and Sezan et al. discloses no means for specifying a plurality of segments included in a plurality of programs. In addition, the shots are typically not important portions.

With respect to claim 16, the rejection is improper, because Sezan et al. does not disclose a playbacking method using the description.

Regarding claim 17, the Office Action notes that the attribute data are video segment information. However, the present invention can also be display that additional information, such as the file name and title of a playbacking program.

Regarding claim 19, the Office Action notes that a description of the slide components is displayed in Fig. 9. However, there is no display of a “description” in the context of the present claims.

Accordingly, the rejection is improper for at least the reasoning provided above.

Nonetheless, another element of the claim is not taught by Sezan et al. As discussed above briefly, the representative frames of different programs along the left-hand column of Fig. 9 are relied upon to teach multiple items of audio/video contents. Also, the key frame views along the bottom of Fig. 9 are relied upon to teach the slide components of an audio/video slide.

However, the claims specify that the slide components (key frames) are composed of important portions of *multiple* items of original audio/video contents, and Sezan et al. does not disclose this feature. Note the following from col. 14, lines 32-34:

Also a set of key frame views are displayed on the lower portion of the display representative of different key frame portions during the *particular selected program*.

(*Emphasis added.*) That is, all key frame views shown in Fig. 9 correspond to a *single* representative frame (the selected frame at the top of the column). Thus, Sezan et al. cannot teach identifying key frame views corresponding to *multiple* items of original audio/video contents as claimed.

The Office Action explains that a user *can* select other representative frames along the left-hand column of Fig. 9, and that selection would cause key frame views to appear that corresponded to a different item of original audio/video contents. Applying to this reasoning, according to the Office Action, Sezan et al. would teach identifying slide components, which are composed of important portions of the *multiple* items of original audio/video contents as claimed.

However, an anticipation rejection cannot be based on what a user *can* do; instead, the applied prior art must actually teach the actions recited in the claims. The cited prior art, that is, Fig. 9 of Sezan et al., only shows identifying key frame views corresponding to a *single* item of original audio/video contents. The ability of a user to cause the Sezan et al. hardware to identify key frame views corresponding to multiple items of original audio/video contents is not a prior art teaching. To justify the anticipation rejection, the PTO is obligated to provide a teaching that such identification is actually made. Because the PTO has not provided such identification, the rejection is unjustified for another reason.

Accordingly, the anticipation rejection of claims 10, 11, and 14-18 should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 19, 20, and 23-27, base claim 19 describes a method of describing summary data of audio/video, and claim 19 explicitly recites that the method includes:

- (1) providing a description of slide components that includes a link description of the temporal relationship between original audio/video contents and the slide components; and
- (2) displaying the description of the slide components.

Claims 20 and 23-27 describe this subject matter by virtue of their dependency from claim 19.

As discussed above, Sezan et al. does not teach providing a *description* of slide components. Certainly, Sezan et al. does not teach “displaying” the description of the key frame views in Fig. 9; Sezan et al. displays the key frame views without a description.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 19, 20, and 23-27 is also improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 13, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sezan et al. in view of additional prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The obviousness rejections of claims 12, 13, 21, and 22 are based on the anticipation rejection of claims 10 and 19 being proper. However, as we explain above, the anticipation rejection is not proper. Accordingly, the obviousness rejections of claims 12, 13, 21, and 22 cannot be proper.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is now solicited.

In view of the remarks above, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowability is now requested. The Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned if necessary to resolve additional issues.

If necessary, the undersigned authorizes deducting any fees that may be due from Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph L. Felber
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,109
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

JLF/af

Q:\2001\010661\010661 response to 1-27-06 action.doc